98 00646

San Francisco Community College District

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
MISSION CAMPUS

Comments and Responses

State Clearinghouse No. 98031068

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES LIBRARY

JUL 17 1998

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Draft EIR Publication Date: May 12, 1998
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date: May 27, 1998
Draft EIR Public Comment Period: May 12 to June 11, 1998
Proposed Final EIR Certification Date: July 21, 1998

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
State of California and California State Library

https://archive.org/details/C119703507

San Francisco Community College District

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO
MISSION CAMPUS

Comments and Responses

State Clearinghouse No. 98031068

Draft EIR Publication Date: May 12, 1998
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date: May 27, 1998
Draft EIR Public Comment Period: May 12 to June 11, 1998
Proposed Final EIR Certification Date: July 21, 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION I.1

How to Use this Report I.2

II. LIST OF COMMENTERS II.1

A. Written Comments II.1

B. Oral Comments II.1

III. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES . . . . . .

I. INTRODUCTION

A Draft Environmental Impact Report (Draft EIR) was prepared by the San Francisco Community College District (District) to disclose potential significant environmental effects of the proposed City College of San Francisco Mission Campus project. The Draft EIR included a description of the proposed new site, an assessment of potential effects from development of a new campus facility on the site, a description of possible mitigation measures to minimize significant effects that were identified in the Draft EIR, and a consideration of alternatives that could address potential impacts. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the Draft EIR was distributed for public review and comment.

The public review period for the Draft EIR began May 12, 1998, and ended June 11, 1998. During this time, the document was available for review by various state and local agencies, as well as by interested organizations and individuals. In addition, the District Board of Trustees held a public hearing on May 27, 1998, to provide the public with an opportunity to present comments about the Draft EIR. Written comments were received from 5 interested individuals and organizations. Oral comments were offered by 8 individuals at the public hearing.

This Comments and Responses document addresses comments on the Draft EIR raised during the public review period, and contains revisions intended to correct and clarify the Draft EIR. Together, the Draft EIR and the Comments and Responses document constitute the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). The District must certify the Final EIR before the project can be approved. Certification requires that the District Board of Trustees make findings that the Final EIR has been completed in compliance with CEQA, that the Final EIR was presented to the District Board of Trustees which reviewed and considered the information in the Final EIR prior to approving the project, and that the Final EIR reflects

the District's independent judgment and analysis. The information provided in this document substantiates and confirms the analyses in the Draft EIR. No new significant environmental impacts and no increase in the severity of an earlier identified impact have been identified as a result of the comments or responses in this document.

HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

This document addresses written and oral comments received during the public review period. Copies of the letters received by the District, and of the transcript of the public hearing, are presented in Chapter III of this document.

This document consists of three chapters: 1) Introduction; 2) List of Commenters; and 3) Comments and Responses. Chapter I, Introduction, reviews the purpose and contents of this Comments and Responses document. Chapter II lists the organizations and individuals who wrote letters or spoke at the public meeting on the Draft EIR. Chapter III reproduces the comment letters and the transcript of oral testimony, and presents responses to environmental issues raised by those comments. For the most part, the responses provide explanation or additional discussion of issues presented in the Draft EIR. In a few instances, the response includes changes to the text of the Draft EIR for accuracy or clarification.

II. LIST OF COMMENTERS

A. WRITTEN COMMENTS

Five letters were received by the District commenting on the Draft EIR. No comments on the Draft EIR were received from public agencies.

- David Blatteis, Blatteis Realty Co.
- Hilda R. Bernstein
- Joanna G. Sacks, Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association
- Marilyn Bair, 700 Block Capp Street Neighbors Association
- Mission Economic Development Association

B. ORAL COMMENTS

In addition to the comment letters, 8 individuals made comments on the Draft EIR at the public hearing on May 27, 1998.

- Dr. Doris Ward
- Jose Mahar, President, Mission Merchants Association
- Dr. Carlota del Portillo, Dean, Mission Campus
- Jose Maestre, Mission Campus Faculty
- David Valentine, Director, Mission Merchants Association
- Luis Granados, Mission Economic Development Association
- Scott Falcon, Mission Economic Development Association
- Raquel Medina, Mission Economic Development Association

III. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

III. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

This chapter presents the written and oral comments received on the Mission Campus Draft EIR. Specific comments in each letter are identified and numbered. Responses to the comments follow each letter, numbered to correspond to the comment number. The public hearing transcript follows the comment letters, with comments identified and numbered. Responses to comments in the transcript are provided following the entire transcript, numbered to correspond to the comments. For example, Response 42 corresponds to the paragraph marked "42" in testimony provided by Jose Mahar at the public hearing.

Retail Property
Specialists

BLATTEIS
REALTY CO
INCORPORATED

San Francisco
Beverly Hills

May 26, 1998

Mr. Peter Goldstein
Chief Operating Officer
San Francisco Community College District
33 Gough Street
San Francisco, Ca. 94013

Dear Mr. Goldstein,

I understand that the College District is planning a new campus at 22nd & Mission which sounds just wonderful.

My family owns some property on Mission Street in this vicinity and would very much like to know more about your plans. Which part of Mission Street will the new campus front? 1 When do you expect to have the project commence and be completed? 2

I thank you in advance for giving us this information.

Cordially yours,
Blatteis Realty Co., Inc.

By: David Blatteis

44 Montgomery Street San Francisco California 94104
(415) 981-2844 FAX (415) 981-4986

David Blatteis, Blatteis Realty Co., Inc., letter of May 26, 1998

Response 1

The proposed new site for a City College Mission Campus is a single, large lot located between 21st and 22nd Streets between Mission and Bartlett Streets, lot 7 in Assessor's Block 3616. The lot contains two existing buildings: 2250 Mission Street and 2558 Mission Street. The proposed site is described in the EIR on p.II.2 and shown on Figure 1, p. II.3.

Response 2

Site acquisition is expected to take place in 1998, if it is approved by the San Francisco Community College District Board of Trustees. As noted on page II.7 of the EIR, obtaining funds to construct new buildings could take four or more years; construction would take about 1 ½ to 2 years.

Hilda R. Bernstein
3333 21st Street
San Francisco,94110

Peter A, Goldstein, COO
S.F. Community College District
33 Gough Street
San Francosco, Ca. 94103.

Dear Mr. Goldstein,

As Chair of the Mayor's Mission Task duting the tenure of former Mayor Agnos and continuing into Mayor Frank Jordan's term, and as President of Liberty Hill Neighborhood Assoc. for five years and currently a vice President, and fore person of the '94-95 San Francisco Civil Grand Jury I have had more than ample opportunity to become familiar with the workings of the City and the needs of the Mission in particular.

For a long time we have been waiting for something to happen on Mission street that would attract investment thereby revitalizing the street. The relocation of the Mission Campus to 2550 and 2558 Mission Street may be that event. In principle and subject to further knowledge re: design etc. I strongly support that move because it provides an opportunity to revitalize that part of Mission Street. I do, however have several concerns which I wish to share with you: 3

Parking: Parking must be provided for students as well as faculty. Parking in the Mission is already a desperate matter. Further incursions on the available space will generate widespread opposition. 4

Revitalization: In order to assure that relocation will have a positive impact upon redevelopment of Mission St. I urge that the College work closely with Mission Economic Development Association which with its extensive experience and expertise will be able to attract and aid businesses that will be relevant to the College community as well as the entire Mission. 5

Movie Space: As a gift to the community and possibly a source of revenue to the college, design the auditorium so that it is usable as a movie theater and make it available to the community which does not now have a movie house. This is of course something that is done by many colleges and universities because among other things it builds valuable bridges to the surrounding communities. 6

Yours truly,

Hilda R. Bernstein

Hilda R. Bernstein

c.c. Carlotta del Portillo

Hilda R. Bernstein, letter (undated, received 5/29/98)

Response 3

A number of commenters, including Ms. Bernstein, expressed support for the proposed new City College Mission Campus site. Expressions of support or opposition to a proposed project do not by themselves address the content or adequacy of the Draft EIR, and no response is required under CEQA. However, such comments will be reviewed and considered by the San Francisco Community College District Board of Trustees when the Board decides whether to approve the project.

Response 4

Additional parking proposed in the new facilities would be for College faculty and staff; none is proposed for students. At present, the Mission Campus at 106 Bartlett Street does not provide parking for students. Because over 80 additional spaces are proposed to be provided at the new site, compared to the 28 now available at the existing Mission Campus facility, faculty and staff who now park in nearby garages, parking lots, or on the street would be accommodated in the new subsurface parking on the new site. This would make up to about 80 additional spaces available for student parking.

The Draft EIR indicates that the expanded college facilities could generate a demand for an additional 156 parking spaces for new students (p. III.48). About 122 parking spaces would be available within one block of the new site to accommodate much of this demand (p. III.48). Added to the 82 spaces vacated as a result of the additional parking proposed for faculty and staff, the total number of spaces available would accommodate the additional parking demand generated by the proposed project.

According to Dr. Carlota del Portillo, Dean of the Mission Campus, no complaints have been received about lack of student parking at the current site during her four years as Dean.

As explained on p. III.42 of the Draft EIR, about 40% of the existing students use transit, and about 25% walk or bicycle to the campus.

Response 5

The project does not propose to include private commercial businesses, as the site is intended for City College use. If a cafe is included as part of the campus, it would likely be a student-run facility. If a bookstore is included, it would be intended to serve primarily City College students.

Response 6

Opening a lecture hall or multipurpose room to the public to show films could occur upon occasion at the new Mission Campus. The primary function of the Mission Campus is and would continue to be educational, and all facilities would be intended primarily for instructional use. Therefore, it would not be possible to convert a lecture hall into the equivalent of a community movie theater on a regular basis, as that would reduce its availability for larger evening classes.

LIBERTY HILL NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
3288 21st Street, Box 44
San Francisco, CA 94110

June 11, 1998

Mr. Peter A. Goldstein
Chief Operating Officer
City College of San Francisco
33 Gough Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Goldstein:

I am writing on behalf of the Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association, an organization of residents and merchants in the neighborhood of the proposed new Mission Campus. The Executive Board of the Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association supports in principle the proposal to consolidate the Mission Campus of the San Francisco City College from the two current sites to one complex on Mission Street, as outlined in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The new Mission Campus, with its expanded facilities and increased student capacity, will do much to serve the residents of the Mission and aid in the revitalization of Mission Street. 7

We have two reservations concerning the proposal, however. We are concerned about the impact on parking in the neighborhood. Finding street parking is already extremely difficult in the area. Any increase in the number of people driving in to the neighborhood will certainly make that situation worse. We urge you to consider all options for providing additional parking for students and faculty (e.g., negotiating to provide parking through the Bartlett Street Garage or other street level lots in the area, etc.). 8

We are also concerned for public safety in and around the new campus. In light of the fact that the proposal projects an increase in the total number of students served, we urge you to take this issue into account as the Community College District moves forward with the new Mission Campus project. 9

We look forward to hearing more about the project as it progresses into its next phase.

Sincerely,

Joanna G. Sacks
1st Vice President
Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association

cc: Natalie Berg, President, City College Board of Trustees
Carlotta del Portilla, Ph.D., Dean, Mission Campus

Joanna G. Sacks, Liberty Hill Neighborhood Association, letter dated June 11, 1998

Response 7

See response 3, above, related to support of the proposed Mission Campus project.

Response 8

See response 4, above related to parking issues.

Response 9

San Francisco Community College District faculty and staff are and will continue to be concerned about public safety. Mission Campus maintains a security staff who would continue to serve the new facility; budgetary issues will determine whether security staff is increased in the future, with or without a new site. The additional evening activity on the proposed site from students attending evening classes could improve public safety along the project block of Mission Street.

Marilyn Bair
700 Block Capp Street Neighbors Assoc.
705 Capp Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

June 10, 1998
Re: Proposed City College Campus

Peter A. Goldstein
San Francisco Community College District
33 Gough Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Goldstein:

After reviewing the Environmental Impact Review (EIR), I have concerns About the impact on my neighborhood and my street which is one block from the proposed City College building site. The following is of particular concern:

- Parking would have tremendous impact. It appears that students would have to park on surrounding streets since no alternatives have been proposed. 10

- Transportation strategies to encourage public transit is not indicated and the proposed estimated 80% use of public transportation by students is not realistic. Even if only 20% drove their cars to class, it would present a great impact involving increased congestion in an already congested area. 11

- Air quality, street cleanliness as well as noise and crowding needs to be addressed. 12

In addition, I am concerned about the loss of the historic Mission Theater including the mural, marquee and interior objects of historic value. 13
Please allow us, the affected community, to be included in the resolution of these issues. 14

Sincerely,

Marilyn Bair

Marilyn Bair
Copies To: Carlotta del Portillo,ED.D, Dean, Mission Campus,City College of SF
MEDA: Raquel Medina, Executive Director

Marilyn Bair, 700 Block Capp Street Neighbors Association, letter dated June 10, 1998

Response 10

See response 3, above, for information about parking proposed for the project site and parking demand that could be generated by the new facilities. As noted in the Draft EIR (p. III.48) additional parking demand would be satisfied in part by on-street parking spaces that can be found within one block of the proposed new site. Within this one-block radius, about 75% of the on-street spaces are metered parking; the remainder is designated for residential permit parking or as handicap or passenger-pickup zones (See p. III.38, and Appendix p. A.32). Parking is also available in local parking garages and off-street lots within one block of the project site. Additional off-street parking is available two or three blocks from the project site (e.g., the lot located on Mission Street between 19th and 20th Streets, described in p. V.5 of the Draft EIR).

Parking demand is generally not considered to be a significant physical environmental impact in an urban location where transit is readily available. The proposed site can be easily accessed by Muni and by BART; some students who may find parking nearby difficult would find it easier to shift to transit use to attend classes at the new Mission Campus facility.

Response 11

Contrary to the commenter's statement, the Draft EIR does not state that 80% of the students use public transit. Table 4 on page III.42 lists the various transportation modes and shows that about 40% use BART or Muni. The assumption that 40% of the new students would use transit to travel to and from the new site is based on several surveys of students conducted by the San Francisco Community College District, as noted in the text on page III.42 and in the source for the project's "mode split" in Table 4 on that page. The mode split and proportion of students who regularly drive to class is also discussed in the Initial Study, on pp. A.32 - A.33 in Appendix A to the Draft EIR. The existing transportation

modes were used in analyzing the transportation effects of expected new students because the proposed new site is located one block from existing Mission Campus facilities and would be one block closer to local bus stops and the BART station.

The impact of additional vehicle trips to the project area from new students that could be accommodated in the new college facilities were analyzed. The results of this analysis are presented in the Transportation section of the Draft EIR, on pages III.43 - III.45. As shown, local intersections nearest to the proposed Mission Campus site would not experience unacceptable delays or traffic congestion as a result of additional project-related traffic.

The endnotes in the Initial Study, presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, included typographical errors which are corrected by the following revisions:

> The present text of note 15, on p. A.36, should be moved to note 17 and replace the text now provided in that note.
>
> Note 15 should read as follows: San Francisco City College, Office of Research and Planning, results of Student Information Surveys for Mission Campus, for fall 1994, spring 1993, fall 1990 and fall 1988.

Response 12

Air quality issues are addressed in the Initial Study, presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR, pp. A.22 - A.23. Noise issues are addressed in the Initial Study on pp. A.28 - A.30. Utilities and Service Systems, including solid waste, are addressed in the Initial Study on p. A.34. The Mission Campus currently has a litter control program at it's 106 Bartlett Street Site; this program would continue at the proposed new site. The new site is approximately one block from the existing Mission Campus site. Therefore, transportation impacts from the new site, including those from pedestrian crowding, would be limited to the additional students that could be accommodated at the new site. As explained in the Draft EIR, the new campus could accommodate about 800 additional students (see pp. II.6 - II.7).

The new buildings at the proposed new site would have entrances on both Mission Street and Bartlett Street, and the Mission Street entrance is expected to lead to an open courtyard; therefore, pedestrian crowding is not expected at the new site. As noted in the Transportation Impacts discussion in the DEIR, pedestrian conditions are not crowded in the area near the proposed project site (p. III.40). Population and housing issues are addressed in the Initial Study on p. A.30.

Response 13

Historic preservation issues, including the New Mission Theater, are discussed in the Draft EIR on pp. III.26 - III.31. As noted there, the New Mission Theater has not been determined to be a significant historic structure in studies that have included the building. Landmark designation by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors does not affect or preserve building interiors unless the landmark building is publicly owned and the interior is specifically designated (see San Francisco City Planning Code Sections 1004(c) and 1005(e)(2)). The interior of the New Mission Theater was not proposed or considered for landmark status, therefore, as part of the analyses and review of the proposed Mission Theater District. The Visual Quality and Urban Design discussion in the Draft EIR acknowledges the change in views of the Mission Street facade and loss of the New Mission Theater sign and marquee on p. III.24. See also Responses 25 and 37.

Response 14

Decisions related to whether to acquire the proposed site will be made by the San Francisco Community College District Board of Trustees at a public hearing, expected to occur in July, 1998. The District has not finalized procedures for obtaining public and agency input into the design of the Mission Campus facility, in part because the construction phase is not expected to occur for several years, as explained on page II.7 of the Draft EIR. At present, there is no state funding for construction of this facility. While no list of community groups or public agencies has been compiled for design review, the District intends to provide broad-based notification of the design process and ask for public input at a public hearing

well in advance of final design approval. Notice will be provided to community organizations and public agencies, as well as interested persons who notify in writing the District Administrative Offices (Attention: Peter Goldstein) at 33 Gough Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, that they would like to be placed on the notice distribution list for design review of the project. See also Responses 41, 44, and 51.

MEDA

Mission Economic Development Association

Peter A. Goldstein
San Francisco Community College District
33 Gough Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

June 9, 1998

Dear Mr. Goldstein:
Below are the Mission Economic Developments comments on the EIR document produced for the proposed Mission Campus of City College on Mission and 22nd Streets.

Concerns

- Level of service would deteriorate…does not stay the same. What mitigations will you employ to ensure that the level of services does not deteriorate and, if anything, improves? 15
- What are the impacts on MUNI? Gave them for BART, but not MUNI. 16
- Who has access to the 1999-2003 Five Year Construction Plan and how is the community an active partner in its implementation? 17
- "The Mission Campus is the District's third highest ranked academic building project in this Five Year Construction Plan." How are these projects ranked and which projects are ranked in first and second places. 18
- The proposed project would further enhance San Francisco's educational services and more effectively use its facilities if it would offer courses for credit. (Objective 7 of the Commerce and Industry Element and Objective 8 of the Community Facilities Element) 19
- Should expect that the multi-purpose room and lecture hall will be used at a high frequency for the same reason that the campus decided to locate there: good access, centered in the community, etc. 20
- Shadow study should be done anyway. The Mission District currently lacks substantial open space, in comparison to other SF neighborhoods, and there is a growing community interest in park planning. A shadow study of any tall building should be done in preparation for this process. 21
- The Mission campus should become a transit first campus. They should sell Fast Passes and provide free parking for bicycles . 22
- What about the economic impact on Mission Street and surrounding commercial areas that having so many students in the area day and night would have. There is no discussion of this. 23
- What about the dirt and noise and dust that will be created during the construction? This neighborhood remembers the disruption caused by BART all too well. 24
- What about preserving some of the internal resources of the New Mission Theater?
- Have any preservation societies been consulted vis-à-vis tearing down this old theater? 25

In the Project Description Section II of the document:

26
- The building structure seems already determined, including height and structure.
- The programs offered have already been determined in terms of classroom mix, number of students attending, and hours of operation.

In the Impacts Section III of the document:

27
- Visual: -height of building is four stories, higher than all surrounding buildings.
  -no recent construction that has been done to this height.

28
- Cultural: -mural on back wall should be preserved with City College funds.
  -demolition of this old, historic theater is significant and should be further analyzed.

29
- Trans-portation -parking is a significant impact not addressed.
  -experience of neighbors near Phelan Campus is not considered.
  -no survey done to see how neighbors feel about students parking in front of their houses all day.
  -it's very optimistic to think that less than 20% of students will drive cars to class.
  -there's no student parking underground, only for faculty.

30
  -no significance criteria for transportation issues are stated.

Additional sections that are necessary to consider Impacts:

31
- Traffic: -there is no serious and exhaustive discussion of traffic, the impact of this project on neighborhood traffic and parking, or a discussion of alternatives

32
- Air Pollution: -same as above
- Dust, dirt, debris: -same as above
- Public Services: -same as above
- Noise: -same as above
- Light and Glare: -same as above
- Energy Consumption: will this project be environmentally friendly?
- Seismic Considerations: how safe is this project seismically?
  is there a safety concern that it will be above BART?

33
- Fiscal Impact on San Francisco's tax payers

In the Mitigation Section IV:

The mitigations listed need to be revised to address community concern regarding the potential impacts on:

34
- Cultural: -City College should further consider more preservation of mural, theater, Marquee, and interior objects of historical significance.

35
- Traffic: -more parking should be provided.
  -more traffic calming measures should be studied and implemented.
  -no mention of bicycle friendly measures.

Signifi-cance Criteria	-should be developed to reflect neighborhood concern. -present criteria are so broad that nothing is significant . .	36

In the Alternatives Section V:

- Project alternatives do not represent feasible scenarios for the City College Project
  -What about an alternative that preserves the Mission Theater?
  -What about an alternative that preserves part of the Mission Theater?
  -What about an alternative that reduces the Square footage of the building and creates some more space for parking?

37

Mission Economic Development Association, letter dated June 9, 1998

Response 15

The transportation analysis in the Draft EIR includes a discussion of potential effects on localized intersections near the proposed project site. This analysis indicates that intersection levels of service (LOS) would deteriorate with traffic from the proposed project and under cumulative growth conditions in the future. As stated on page III.40, LOS D is considered to be an acceptable condition in San Francisco; no local intersection was shown to deteriorate below LOS D under either existing-plus-project or cumulative conditions (see Tables 5 and 6, pp. III.44 and III.45). Therefore, the project would not cause or contribute to significant traffic impacts and no mitigation measures are required.

Response 16

Impacts to local transit systems are discussed on pp. III.45 - III.47. Impacts to Muni are thoroughly analyzed in the Draft EIR and are summarized in Tables 7 and 8 on pp. III.46 and III.47. As stated in the table title, Table 8, "Cumulative-With-Project Muni Use Summary," does not include BART service, but analyzes effects on Muni service in the project vicinity. Cumulative impacts on BART are discussed in the text on pp. III.46 - III.47. Note that the project analysis of effects on transit was carried out using two conservative assumptions: 1) that all transit riders would use Muni, and 2) that all transit riders would use BART. Neither analysis showed significant effects on transit service.

Response 17

The 1999 - 2003 Five Year Construction Plan is available for review at the District's main offices at 33 Gough Street and at the Phelan Campus Library.

Response 18

A Community College committee reviews all items proposed in the Five-Year Construction Plan and ranks them based on the Committee's perception of the needs of City College as a whole. That ranking is submitted to the San Francisco Community College District Board of Trustees for review and ratification at a public hearing.

Response 19

Whether or not courses are offered for credit at the Mission Campus is not a physical environmental impact that requires analysis in the project's EIR. The *San Francisco General Plan* policies in the Commerce and Industry Element and the Community Facilities Element related to educational services do not differentiate among courses offered for credit and those not offered for credit.

Response 20

As noted on page III.10 of the Draft EIR, the likely frequency of use of the proposed multi-purpose room for community-related activities is not known, and therefore cannot be analyzed at this stage in the project's planning process. The Mission Campus is proposed as an educational facility, not as a community center. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that general community use of the buildings would occur occasionally, rather than on regular, daily basis warranting specific evaluation in the EIR. See also Response 6, above.

Response 21

A shadow study would be premature because no building designs have been prepared for the proposed site. Section 295 of the City Planning Code, if applied to the City College Mission Campus site, would not require analysis of shadow effects on sites that are not under San Francisco Recreation and Park Department jurisdiction. Should there be property under consideration for acquisition or already acquired by the Recreation and Park Department at

the time buildings are being designed for the new site, the District would consider the applicability of Planning Code Section 295.

Response 22

The existing Mission Campus provides free parking for bicycles, and as noted in the Initial Study, free bicycle parking is expected to be provided at the new site (see p. A.33). Traffic impacts were not shown to be significant environmental effects; therefore it is not necessary to include transportation mitigation measures such as sale of transit passes in the EIR. Sale of transit passes at the Mission Campus would likely be a convenience for many students, although it is not expected that such sale would increase the already high proportion of students who use transit to travel to/from classes (see also Response 11, above).

Response 23

Economic impacts are not required to be discussed in Environmental Impact Reports, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act section 21100(d) and State CEQA Guidelines section 15382. As noted in the Draft EIR on page III.10, it is not expected that the project would substantially change land uses in the vicinity of the new site. The area would remain mixed-use retail, residential, and institutional. It is anticipated that campus programs and additional students may bring new economic vitality to the nearby area.

Response 24

Construction dust and noise are discussed in the Initial Study, as noted in Response 12, above. Appendix A pp. A.22 - A.23 discuss construction dust and provide mitigation measures for potential construction air quality effects. Noise is discussed on pp. A.28 - A.30, including construction noise and mitigation for construction noise. These construction-related air quality and noise mitigation measures are also listed in Chapter IV, Mitigation Measures, in Section B, Mitigation Measures Included in the Project, on pp. IV.3 - IV.4.

Response 25

Because the analysis shows that there are no significant architectural resources on the project site, preservation of the existing buildings is not required to be considered in the EIR. The San Francisco Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board files were reviewed as part of the cultural resources evaluation, along with several articles about the New Mission Theater, as cited in Section III.C, Cultural Resources in the Draft EIR. The Foundation for San Francisco's Architectural Heritage received notice of the availability of the Draft EIR for the Mission Campus project; no comments were received from this preservation organization. The State Office of Historic Preservation received a copy of the Draft EIR through the State Clearinghouse; no comments were received from this or any other state agency during the public comment period.

Response 26

The expected building height has been generally established to insure that whatever specific structures are designed for the site would be in conformity with the overall building heights in the neighborhood. However, no specific building designs have been prepared. The massing diagrams used in the Draft EIR are general examples of buildings that could be built on the site, used to provide a general discussion of potential visual effects. Preparation of detailed design documents will be one of the many steps in establishing a new Mission Campus if the Board of Trustees decides to acquire the proposed site.

Specific classes and programs have not been established, beyond classes now offered at the existing site or classes that are similar to those now offered. It is not necessary to establish a precise class list to estimate the likely numbers of classrooms and laboratories on the new site or to analyze potential environmental effects of the proposed new campus. The *Needs Assessment* used information from interviews and surveys of the faculty and staff; from interviews with members of the Board of Trustees of the Community College District; from 4 public workshops; and from various interviews with faculty, students and community organization representatives, to determine an approximate program for the new campus in

order to establish minimum parameters for a new site and approximate sizes of potential new buildings.[1] The *Needs Assessment* is a schematic program intended to be used to identify appropriate sites and funding needs; it does not establish a final program of courses for the Campus.

Response 27

As noted in Response 26, the building height has been generally established, but has not been finalized. The legislated height limits for the project site in the San Francisco Planning Code Zoning Map would permit a building up to 65 feet tall, more than 10 feet taller than heights proposed for the Mission Campus buildings. A 50-foot-tall building would be slightly taller than the existing buildings on Bartlett Street but it would not be taller than the existing theater auditorium with the balcony addition on the north. On Mission Street, the massing diagrams shown in Figures 6 and 7, pp. III.21 and III.22, show buildings that would be about the same height as adjacent buildings to the south of the project site, and about one story taller than buildings adjacent to the north. As noted on page III.20, "Height differences between adjacent buildings are typical along this portion of Mission Street."

Response 28

Funding for preservation of the mural "Butterflies" is not a physical environmental issue and need not be addressed in the EIR. However, as stated in the DEIR on p. IV.2 - IV.3, the District has committed to fund removal of the mural if the expense is not unreasonable.

As explained in Responses 25 and 13, above, information and data reviewed and cited in the EIR do not provide any evidence that the existing theater building is a significant historic resource. The comment does not provide any new evidence to contradict this determination.

---

[1] Diseño, *Mission Campus: Needs Assessment and Schematic Program Study,* 18 September 1997, pp. 4 - 6.

Response 29

A number of transportation points are made in this item. As noted in the Draft EIR on p. III.47, a parking deficit is not considered to be a significant physical environmental impact in San Francisco because the City has a "transit first" policy in order to discourage automobile use and reduce vehicular congestion and air emissions. Transit is easily available in most locations in the City, particularly at the proposed location of the new Mission Campus. Providing large amounts of parking encourages use of the automobile instead of use of transit by those who travel to a site for school or work. When parking is limited, some drivers will be inconvenienced, and some will shift to transit as their primary means of travel, reducing air pollution in the region.

However, the proposed project would not create a parking deficit in any event. The Draft EIR parking analysis points out that sufficient parking for the expected demand is likely to be available within a short distance of the new site (see p. III.48). The fact that the proposed new parking garage would serve only faculty and staff would not change this result.

As explained in Response 11, above, the basis for the proportion of students expected to drive to class and the proportion expected to use transit or walk to the school is four surveys of students at the various City College Campuses conducted during the fall 1988, 1990 and 1994 and spring 1993. All show that less than 20% of the students at the existing Mission Campus drive. Thus, use of this figure in the DEIR is reasonable and is not unrealistically optimistic.

Response 30

Contrary to the commenter's statement, significance criteria for the transportation analysis are provided in the Draft EIR on page III.40.

Response 31

The transportation section of Chapter III of the Draft EIR includes a detailed discussion of potential traffic impacts in the area surrounding the proposed project site on pages III.43 - III.45. The intersections selected for study are those most likely to be seriously affected by additional traffic from the project, based on existing levels of service in the area. Parking impacts are discussed in the Initial Study, Appendix A in the Draft EIR, on page A.32 - A.33 and in Chapter III on pages III.47 - II.48. Alternatives are analyzed in Chapter V of the Draft EIR; because no significant transportation impacts were shown to result from the proposed project, there is no requirement to provide for any transportation-related alternatives. Alternatives in the EIR are designed to avoid or substantially lessen significant effects identified in the impacts analyses.

Response 32

All of the topics included in this comment except light and glare are addressed in the Initial Study that was circulated with the Notice of Preparation in March, 1998. The Initial Study is also presented in Appendix A of the Draft EIR.

Air quality impacts are discussed in the Initial Study, as noted above under Responses 12 and 24. Dust from construction activities is included in this discussion.

The proposed site is fully served by the necessary public services and utilities, as the location is already fully developed. This point is noted in the Initial Study, Appendix A, pp. A.30 - A.31 and A.34 Therefore no further discussion or analysis of Public Services or Utilities is necessary.

Noise impacts are fully discussed in the Initial Study on pp. A.28-A.30, as explained under Responses 12 and 24, above. Construction noise mitigation measures have been included in the project.

Light and glare is discussed in the Draft EIR on pages III.24 - III.25.

Energy consumption is discussed in the Initial Study on p. A.24. As noted there, new buildings would be more energy efficient than those now in use by Mission Campus, because Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations requires energy efficient construction, unlike the requirements in effect when the existing facilities were built, and because more efficient electrical appliances and lighting have been designed and developed since the existing facilities were built.

As noted in the Initial Study on Appendix page A.24, the project site is not in a special geologic study zone nor is it located close to an active fault. New buildings must be designed to meet current structural and seismic safety requirements, which are stricter than those in effect when the existing facilities were built. No further analysis of seismic issues is required. The building site itself is not directly above the BART tunnel; the tunnel is under the street right-of-way. Any building designed for the site would be required to meet the California Building Code seismic safety standards found in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. Inclusion of alternatives addressing ways to reduce these impacts is not required or appropriate in view of the fact that these impacts are not significant.

Response 33

Fiscal and economic impacts are not required to be discussed in environmental review documents under CEQA, as noted above in Response 23.

Response 34

Mitigation measures are included in Chapter IV for the potential loss of the mural on the Bartlett Street facade of the New Mission Theater. Because the commenter does not recommend any particular mitigation measure for preserving the mural, the District cannot respond with particularity. The mitigation measures provided in the Draft EIR fully comply with state law requirements for the preservation of fine art, as defined in the statute. In

addition, the mitigation measures go well beyond those requirements, providing that under certain conditions the District may pay reasonable costs of removing the mural and, if removal is infeasible, the District may solicit a proposal for another mural for the new building.

While some members of the community may wish to preserve elements of the New Mission Theater, other members of the community may prefer replacement of the old building with a new college building. See, e.g., Comment 55. In addition, CEQA does not require mitigation measures related to loss of the New Mission Theater building, its interior, or the marquee or sign, because analysis in the EIR shows that loss of the building is not a significant environmental impact.

Response 35

As the transportation impacts analysis in Chapter III did not show that the project would cause any significant traffic, parking or bicycle impacts, the EIR is not required to include mitigation measures for these issues. Providing more parking could encourage more Campus users to drive to the site, increasing traffic and air emissions in the vicinity of the project site. As noted in the Initial Study on page A.33, bicycle parking is expected to be provided at the proposed new site.

Response 36

Significance criteria are based on adopted standards of public agencies when possible. For example, air quality significance criteria are usually developed from emissions criteria established under the California and Federal Clean Air Acts and related regulations. Others are based on accepted practices of local agencies. For the Mission Campus EIR, the District used the transportation criteria used in the City and County of San Francisco: intersections experience significant impacts if a project would reduce the Level of Service to E or worse; transit service would experience significant impacts if a project would cause the carriers to exceed their capacity standards. A city or county's General Plan may contain environmental

policies that provide standards against which to measure potential impacts of a proposed project. Loss of a listed or otherwise designated historic resource is generally found to be a significant environmental effect in most jurisdictions, as set forth in CEQA section 21084.1. Significance criteria under CEQA are not generally tied to concerns of a particular segment of a community, but reflect more broad-based community-wide or state-wide standards.

The significance criteria included in the Draft EIR for the proposed Mission Campus are typical of those used in San Francisco and many other jurisdictions, and are appropriate under CEQA. Contrary to the commenter's statement, those standards did result in two significant impacts in the Draft EIR -- removal of the mural Butterflies facing Bartlett Street, and potential disturbance of archaeological resources. It is not surprising that the EIR found few significant impacts resulting from the project, given that the college operates its current program in buildings very close to the proposed site, the college development on the new site would not vary greatly in scale from what currently exists there, and the additional numbers of automobiles and students anticipated as a result of the project are not very large.

Response 37

As explained in Response 25, above, the discussion of the existing buildings on the proposed project site shows that the New Mission Theater was analyzed by the Planning Department's Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board as part of a proposed Mission Theater District and was not designated as a significant structure during that analysis. CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines call for analysis of alternatives that would reduce otherwise significant environmental effects cause by a proposed project (see, e.g., State CEQA Guidelines section 15126(d)(1). Because loss of the theater building has not been shown to be a significant environmental impact, alternatives preserving the building or portions of its interior are not required to be presented in the EIR.

As with a mitigation measure that provided more parking, discussed in Response 35, above, an alternative that provided more parking could encourage more people to drive to the Mission Campus. This would not reduce any significant transportation environmental impacts of the project, and could increase traffic congestion and air emissions in the project vicinity.

SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

PUBLIC HEARING

REGULAR MEETING OF THE

HONORABLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1998

CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

33 GOUGH STREET

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

REPORTED BY: AURA N. CLENDENEN, CSR 10080

A P P E A R A N C E S

THE HONORABLE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

ROBERT E. BURTON

NATALIE BERG

JAMES HASKELL MAYO, II

RODEL E. RODIS

ANDREA D. SHORTER

ROBERT P. VARNI

LAWRENCE WONG

DEL M. ANDERSON, CHANCELLOR

RON LEE, GENERAL COUNSEL

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT ON WEDNESDAY,

MAY 27, 1998, COMMENCING AT THE HOUR OF 7:46 P.M. THEREOF, AT CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO, 33 GOUGH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, BEFORE ME, AURA N. CLENDENEN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THE FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD.

PRESIDENT RODIS: THE PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT OF THE PROPOSED MISSION CAMPUS SITE IS NOW IN ORDER.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE?

COUNSEL LEE: NO NEED.

PRESIDENT RODIS: GOOD EVENING, EVERYONE. THANK YOU FOR ATTENDING TONIGHT.

I'D LIKE TO OPEN THIS PUBLIC HEARING STARTING THE OFFICIAL RECORD THAT WILL BE KEPT BY THE COURT REPORTER OVER THERE.

BEFORE WE BEGIN, I WILL SPEND A FEW MINUTES EXPLAINING THE PURPOSE OF THIS PUBLIC MEETING AND HOW IT WILL BE CONDUCTED.

THIS IS THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC HEARING ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED CITY COLLEGE MISSION CAMPUS PROJECT, WHICH I WILL REFER TO AS THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

MY NAME IS RODEL RODIS, PRESIDENT OF

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT, AND I WILL BE CHAIRING THE HEARING THIS EVENING. THIS HEARING IS BEING CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT'S PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT.

THE PURPOSE OF THE HEARING IS TO PROVIDE THE PUBLIC WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO COMMENT ON AND PRESENT EVIDENCE RELATING TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT. THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT IS COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS THE EIR. ALL COMMENTS MADE TONIGHT WILL BE RECORDED BY THE COURT REPORTER AND WILL BECOME PART OF THE FORMAL RECORD.

THE TRANSCRIPT OF THIS HEARING WILL BE PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY DISTRICT, THE LEAD AGENCY FOR THIS ACTION, FOR OUR REVIEW WHEN WE CONSIDER A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT. ALL TESTIMONY THIS EVENING AS WELL AS ALL WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD WILL BECOME PART OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THIS PROJECT.

THE DISTRICT WILL EVALUATE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND WILL INCLUDE WRITTEN RESPONSES TO THESE COMMENTS IN THE FINAL EIR. THOSE OF YOU WHO DO NOT WISH TO SPEAK TONIGHT BUT WHO HAVE COMMENTS OR CONCERNS ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT MAY SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS IN WRITING.

WRITTEN COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED BY 5:00 P.M. THURSDAY JUNE 11TH, 1998, IN ORDER TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE DISTRICT. JUNE 11TH IS THE CLOSE OF THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT HEARING ON THE DRAFT EIR. WRITTEN COMMENTS SHOULD BE SENT TO PETER GOLDSTEIN 33 GOUGH STREET, SAN FRANCISCO 94103.

COPIES OF THE DRAFT EIR ARE AVAILABLE HERE TONIGHT FOR ANYONE TO TAKE. IN ADDITION, COPIES OF THE DRAFT EIR MAY BE REVIEWED AT THE MAIN PUBLIC LIBRARY AND THE MISSION BRANCH OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY.

I ENCOURAGE SPEAKERS WHO AGREE WITH PREVIOUS SPEAKERS TO SIMPLY CONFIRM THEIR AGREEMENT IN ORDER TO AVOID REPETITION. EVERYONE WHO WISHES TO SPEAK THIS EVENING WILL BE ALLOWED TO SPEAK. ANYONE WHO WOULD LIKE TO SPEAK SHOULD FILL OUT A YELLOW CARD SO

INDICATING AT THE SIGN-UP TABLE AND I'LL CALL YOU IN THE ORDER I RECEIVE YOUR CARD. EACH SPEAKER WILL BE GIVEN THREE MINUTES TO SPEAK.

SO THAT YOUR TESTIMONY CAN BE ACCURATELY RECORDED AND THE DISTRICT CAN RESPOND ADEQUATELY TO YOUR COMMENTS IN THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, I WOULD ASK EACH SPEAKER TO COME SPEAK INTO THE MICROPHONE.

AS I STATED PREVIOUSLY, THE PURPOSE OF THIS HEARING IS TO RECEIVE PUBLIC TESTIMONY ON THE EIR FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT MISSION CAMPUS PROJECT; THEREFORE, BOARD MEMBERS WILL NOT RESPOND TO COMMENTS OR CONCERNS TONIGHT.

AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD ON JUNE 11TH, THE DISTRICT WILL REVIEW ALL COMMENTS RECEIVED AND WILL PREPARE WRITTEN RESPONSES THAT WILL BE PUBLISHED IN THE FINAL EIR AND IS EXPECTED TO BE COMPLETED IN JULY.

BEFORE DECIDING WHETHER TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED PROJECT, THE DISTRICT WILL CONSIDER THE FINAL EIR, THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES AND

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT.

WE WILL BE GLAD TO ANSWER ANY PROCEDURAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE HEARING THIS EVENING. IF ANYONE HAS ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS HEARING, PLEASE ASK NOW.

THE MEETING IS NOW OPEN FOR THE MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC TO COME FORWARD TO MAKE COMMENTS. I'D LIKE TO FIRST ALL ON OUR ASSESSOR: DR. DORIS WARD, FORMER COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE.

MS. WARD: THANK YOU VERY MUCH, PRESIDENT RODIS, AND CHANCELLOR ANDERSON, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, AND MR. LEE.

AS I SAID LAST WEEK AT THE CHINATOWN HEARING, I'M REALLY FEELING SO GOOD ABOUT BEING BACK HERE. I MAY RUN FOR THIS BOARD AGAIN.

AS I MENTIONED LAST WEEK, I LIKE THIS BOARD BETTER THAN WHEN I WAS -- THAN WHEN I WAS ON THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. IT WAS A BOARD THAT WAS A FUN BOARD. WE WERE DOING THINGS THAT WE CAN AGREE ON, MOSTLY BECAUSE WE RECOGNIZED THAT EDUCATION WAS EXTREMELY IMPORTANT AND THAT WE ALL AGREED UPON, WHICH IS DIFFERENT FROM THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS: EVERYBODY GOES IN DIFFERENT DIRECTIONS.

BUT BE THAT AS IT MAY, I'M VERY PLEASED TO BE HERE TODAY TO OFFER MY SUPPORT TO THE MISSION CAMPUS OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE.

IT IS SO VERY, VERY IMPORTANT THAT YOU DO THAT -- YOU DO BUILD A CAMPUS DOWN HERE OR BUY ONE, WHICHEVER YOU INTEND TO DO, BECAUSE THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN THIS COMMUNITY MUST BE SERVED. THERE IS A TREMENDOUS NEED. THIS COMMUNITY IS GOING TO GROW MUCH LARGER THAN IT IS EVEN TODAY, AND YOU NEED A FACILITY THAT WILL ADDRESS THE KINDS OF PROGRAMS THAT WE NEED AS WE GO INTO THE 21ST CENTURY AND WE FIND THAT THERE WILL BE NEW KINDS OF PROGRAMS AND NEW KINDS OF CAREERS ON THE CUTTING LINE, AND PEOPLE NEED TO BE PREPARED FOR THOSE KIND OF CAREERS AND THINGS. THE MISSION DISTRICT ABSOLUTELY NEEDS A CAMPUS HERE.

38

I APPLAUD YOU AND CONGRATULATE YOU, ALL OF YOU WHO ARE PART OF THIS AND SUPPORT THIS PROGRAM. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

TRUSTEE RODIS: NEXT IS JOSE MAHAR WITH THE MISSION MERCHANT ASSOCIATION, PRESIDENT.

MR. MAHAR: GOOD EVENING, TRUSTEES. THANK YOU FOR HEARING ME AT THIS TIME.

I JUST WANT TO SAY AS PRESIDENT OF

39

THE MISSION MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION THAT WE STRONGLY SUPPORT THE MISSION CAMPUS COMING TO THE MISSION WITH ALL THAT'S GOING ON IN THE MISSION. I COMPLETELY AGREE WITH COUNTY ASSESSOR WARD IN THAT WE NEED TO MEET THE NEEDS, THE EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, AS THE COMMUNITY GROWS.

39

HOWEVER, WE DO NEED TO ALSO BE AWARE THAT THIS IS A COMMERCIAL DISTRICT, THAT THE PROPOSED SITE IS GOING TO BE ON, AND THAT IS ONE THING THAT REALLY CONCERNS THE MERCHANTS, AND THAT IS THE STORE FRONT AND THE SITES, HOW BAD IT'S GOING TO HAVE AN EFFECT ON THE STREET (INAUDIBLE).

40

WE HAVE A PROBLEM RIGHT NOW WITH YOUTH GANGS, AND WE'RE LOOKING TO BRIGHTEN UP MISSION STREET AND HAVE STORES OPEN AND LIGHTING AND NOT DARK CORNERS OR CUBBYHOLES OR THINGS THAT WOULD ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO HANG OUT, MILL AROUND, OR SPRAY PAINT GRAFFITI.

WE DID HAVE DR. DEL PORTILLO COME SPEAK TO OUR GENERAL MEMBERSHIP A COUPLE OF MONTHS AGO. AT THAT TIME, THE MEMBERSHIP MADE THE POINT THAT WE ARE VERY INTERESTED IN IT. WE HAVE ALREADY FORMED AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE SO

41

THAT WE CAN MEET WITH THE PEOPLE THAT ARE GOING TO BE DOING THIS OR THE FINAL RESULTS.

WE STILL HAVEN'T DONE THAT. I WOULD JUST LIKE TO REITERATE THAT WE STRONGLY -- MISSION MERCHANTS WOULD LIKE TO HAVE INVOLVEMENT AND INPUT ON WHAT'S GOING ON AND WHAT'S GOING TO BE HAPPENING ON MISSION STREET. SO IF THERE IS SOME OTHER MEETINGS, WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A LITTLE MORE ACCESS TO THAT.

41

I KNOW SOME PEOPLE WERE A LITTLE CONCERNED ABOUT THE NOTIFICATION AND NOT ENOUGH PEOPLE BEING NOTIFIED. I DON'T KNOW IF IT'S THE RAIN THAT'S KEPT PEOPLE OUT OR JUST THE GENERAL OUTREACH. BUT FOR PEOPLE THAT ARE HERE, THIS IS OUR RESPONSIBILITY. IT'S OUR JOB. WE'RE HERE TO DO THIS.

BUT SOME OF THE OTHER PEOPLE DON'T REALLY HAVE ACCESS OR THEY'RE NOT IN THE SAME LINE THAT WE ARE IN EVERY DAY WHERE WE'RE LOOKING FOR THESE THINGS AND WE'RE FOLLOWING THEM.

THAT'S SOMETHING ELSE I JUST WANTED TO POINT OUT THAT WE REALLY DO PUBLIC OUTREACH, NOT TO JUST TO THE MERCHANTS BUT TO THE PEOPLE

THAT LIVE IN THE COMMUNITY BECAUSE WE ALL MAKE UP THE NEIGHBORHOOD THAT'S CALLED THE MISSION.

SO I APPLAUD THE EFFORTS AS WELL AND I REALLY ENCOURAGE YOU TO LOOK FOR MORE MISSION MERCHANT INPUT AND NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT AS WELL. THANK YOU. 42

TRUSTEE RODIS: WE'LL HEAR FROM DEAN CARLOTA DEL PORTILLO FOR THE MISSION CAMPUS.

DR. DEL PORTILLO: THANK YOU, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, CHANCELLOR ANDERSON, MR. LEE, FRIENDS, COLLEAGUES, ET CETERA, ET CETERA.

WHEN THINGS ARE DONE WELL, THEY LOOK VERY EASY, AND THIS AN EXCEPTIONALLY WELL-DONE STUDY. AND IT LOOKS AS IF "OH, WE JUST FOUND SOME STUFF AND PUT IT TOGETHER."

IT WAS VERY THOUGHTFUL. IT WAS VERY THOROUGH. THEY WERE SO CAREFUL THAT I THOUGHT IT WOULD NEVER END. EVERYTHING WAS CHECKED OUT AND DOUBLED CHECKED.

I WANT TO TAKE THE OPPORTUNITY TO THANK PETER GOLDSTEIN FOR HIS LEADERSHIP IN THE PROCESS. IT TOOK A LOT OF HOURS AND A LOT OF PATIENCE, AND THAT'S WHY WE HAVE AS GOOD A PRODUCT.

I ALSO APPRECIATE TRUSTEE WONG'S CONCERNS AND ATTENTION, AND I LOOK FORWARD TO CONTINUE TO WORK WITH YOU.

I'M CONSCIOUS OF YOUR TIME, AND I JUST WANT TO TELL YOU THAT PART OF THE PROCESS WAS MEETING WITH MISSION MERCHANTS, ANSWERING INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS, AND ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS OF COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS WHO FELT THAT THEY DESERVE A ONE-TO-ONE (MEETING) AS OPPOSED TO JUST BEING INCLUDED OR HOPING THAT SOMEBODY ELSE WOULD TELL THEM. 43

SO FAR I HAVE SERVED AS LIAISON TO THE COMMUNITY BECAUSE ALL THAT WE'VE DONE IS BASICALLY -- UP TO NOW -- IS THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY. WE'RE NOT AT THE POINT OF CHOOSING AN ARCHITECT. WE'RE NOT AT THE POINT OF DOING ANYTHING ELSE. SO THAT'S WHY THE PROCESS, IN A SENSE, HAS BEEN LIMITED.

I MET WITH RAQUEL MEDINA, DIRECTOR OF MEDA. WE HAD A VERY GOOD MEETING, AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT WE CONCLUDED IS BECAUSE OF THE ROLE THAT MEDA PLAYED -- THAT'S THE MISSION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION -- BECAUSE OF THE ROLE THAT MEDA PLAYS AND BECAUSE IT REACHES OUT TO SO MANY PEOPLE IN THE COMMUNITY THAT 44

MEDA WOULD BE ONE OF THE PRIME ORGANIZATIONS THAT WE WOULD WORK WITH IN MAKING SURE THAT INFORMATION ALLOWED, PARTICULARLY WHEN IT COMES TO THE PROCESS OF INVOLVING THE COMMUNITY AND THE PROCESS OF PUTTING OUT THE RFP.

I THINK WE HAVE DONE WELL. I LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THE COMMUNITY AND, YOU KNOW, EVERYBODY THAT WANTS TO BE INVOLVED. THE MISSION CAMPUS WILL BE AN ASSET. IT IS NOT SOMETHING THAT CITY COLLEGE CAN DO ALONE. IT'S NOT SOMETHING THAT THE PEOPLE AT THE MISSION CAMPUS CAN DO ALONE. IT WILL BELONG TO THE COMMUNITY. THEY WILL BE INVOLVED, AND WE LOOK FORWARD TO WORKING WITH THEM. THANK YOU.

TRUSTEE RODIS: OF THE MISSION CAMPUS, JOSE MAESTRE.

MR. MAESTRE: THANK YOU PRESIDENT, RODIS AND CHANCELLOR ANDERSON, MEMBERS OF THE BOARD AND DR. LEE.

THIS IS A VERY HAPPY OCCASION FOR US. IN THE PAST, YOU'VE SEEN A UNHAPPY LOOK ON MY FACE AT TIMES. RIGHT? SOMETIMES YOU DON'T WANT TO TALK TO ME OR THE MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE, BUT WE FINALLY HAVE ARRIVED AT A POINT WHICH I'D LIKE TO ADVISE THE COMMUNITY:

WE DON'T HAVE THE BUILDING YET. SO YOU DON'T WANT TO GET UPSET. THE BUILDING IS NOT THIS DOCUMENT. THIS IS JUST THE PERMISSION WE HAVE FROM THE CITY THAT THERE AREN'T ANY OBJECTIONS TO US BUILDING THAT. WE MAY EVEN FIND AN ARTIFACT. I HOPE WE DON'T FIND A BUILT DOWN MANOGEN (PHONETIC), BECAUSE THAT WOULD REALLY BE A MESS.

I WANT TO THANK THE BOARD. THANK BARBARA FOR THE HELP. SHE REALLY MOVED US THROUGH. SHE CAME DOWN TO SEE US, AND I ESPECIALLY WANT TO THANK PETER FOR MAKING SURE WE DIDN'T TRIP UP.

I UNDERSTAND YOUR RETICENCE IN THE BEGINNING BECAUSE WE DID NOT WANT TO COMMIT THE DISTRICT TO A BUILDING. WE WERE JUST LOOKING AT THEM, STANDING OUTSIDE AND SAYING "ISN'T THAT NICE?" BUT WE DIDN'T SIGN ANY AGREEMENTS.

SO HERE WE ARE ON THE EDGE OF GETTING THE MONEY, AND THAT'S OUR NEXT STEP.

I GUESS WE'LL BE CONTACTING SOME OF YOU THROUGH THE COMING MONTHS FOR YOUR GUIDANCE IN GETTING THE MONEY. WE THANK YOU AGAIN VERY MUCH.

PRESIDENT RODIS: NEXT DAVID VALENTINE, THE DIRECTOR OF MISSION MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION.

MR. VALENTINE: AND MERCHANT IN THE AREA ALSO. I'M JUST APPROXIMATELY ONE BLOCK FROM YOUR PROPOSED CAMPUS, AND I WOULD STRONGLY URGE THE TRUSTEES TO PURSUE THE MISSION CAMPUS AS OPPOSED TO THE OTHER ALTERNATIVES. 46

MANY OF US BUSINESSES IN THE MISSION WELCOME THIS NEW BUILDING ON MISSION STREET. WE THINK IT WILL BRING A LOT OF ACTIVITY COMMERCIALLY TO US, AND WE THINK IT WILL HELP US WITH OUR PROBLEMS WITH THE GANGS, TOO MANY PEOPLE COMING IN FOR THEM TO BE HAPPILY TAKING UP DARK CORNERS ON THE STREET. 47

I HAVE NOT FOUND AMONG MY FELLOW MERCHANTS ANY OPPOSITION TO THIS CAMPUS. I KNOW WE WILL GROWL AND COMPLAIN A BIT: CONSTRUCTION BLOCKS THE STREET AND THE STREET IS PRETTY HEAVILY TRAVELED AS IT IS NOW. BUT WE ALL WISH IT WERE BUILT AND IN EXISTENCE RIGHT NOW. THANK YOU. 48

TRUSTEE RODIS: THANK YOU.

NEXT IS LUIS GRANADOS.

MR. GRANADOS: HI, MY NAME IS LUIS RANADOS. I'M A STAFF MEMBER OF MEDA, THE

MISSION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION. AND I JUST HAVE TO SAY THAT WE'RE VERY HAPPY THAT THE CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO IS PUTTING A NEW FACILITY AT 22ND AND MISSION. 49

HOWEVER, IT IS CLEAR BY THE TENANTS AT THIS MEETING THAT THERE HASN'T BEEN ENOUGH COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, ENOUGH COMMUNITY OUTREACH. IF YOU GO TO THE CAT STREET NEIGHBORS' MEETING, WHICH IS ONE BLOCK, YOU GET 20 PEOPLE AT THAT MEETING. IF YOU GO TO THE 16TH STREET NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING, YOU GET 30 PEOPLE THERE. IF YOU GO TO FRIENDS OF DOLORES PARK, YOU GET 40 PEOPLE THERE. 50

OBVIOUSLY, IT FEELS LIKE THE MAILING LIST IS NOT CORRECT. THE OUTREACH WASN'T NECESSARILY DONE FOR THIS MEETING. IT WASN'T APPROPRIATELY DONE. SO WE WOULD ENCOURAGE THAT THE MAILING LIST BE UPDATED AND THAT MORE EXTENSIVE AND FOCUSED COMMUNITY OUTREACH BE DONE.

IN TERMS OF THE EIR, PEOPLE ARE TALKING THAT THIS IS NOT A BUILDING. THIS IS JUST A DOCUMENT. I'VE BEEN WORKING FOR THE LAST PAST 10 YEARS PREPARING EIR'S, AND ONE OF THE THINGS THAT PEOPLE NEED TO REALIZE IS THAT 51

BY TIME THE EIR IS WRITTEN, ONE OF THE THINGS THAT NEEDS TO HAPPEN IN PREPARING AN EIR IS THAT A PROJECT DESCRIPTION MUST BE COMPLETED IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THE POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT OF THAT PROJECT.

SO WHAT THAT MEANS IS THAT BY NOW A PROGRAM AND POTENTIAL (INAUDIBLE) ENVELOPE HAS ALREADY BEEN IDENTIFIED AND DETERMINED.

51 IT WOULD BE FINE, BUT HOWEVER, THE PEOPLE IN THE MISSION HAVEN'T HAD ENOUGH INPUT AS TO WHAT THAT ENVELOP MAY LOOK LIKE AS TO WHAT PROGRAMS WOULD BE CARRIED OUT AT THIS CAMPUS. I THINK THAT -- I'VE HEARD COMMENTS THAT A LOT OF THE CLASSES THAT ARE CARRIED OUT IN THE MISSION CAMPUS RIGHT NOW ARE REMEDIAL, THAT THEY WANT TO HAVE MORE OF A BALANCE BETWEEN REMEDIAL AND PROFESSIONAL CLASSES. THOSE ARE JUST SOME OF THE COMMENTS THAT I'VE HEARD.

IN TERMS OF MEDA, I KNOW THAT WE ARE LEADING VARIOUS COMMUNITY PROCESSES IN THE MISSION THAT RELATE TO MISSION STREET, THAT RELATE TO DOLORES PARK, THAT RELATE TO VARIOUS THINGS IN THE MISSION. IF YOU GUYS WANT TO FIND OUT HOW TO DO BETTER OUTREACH AND HOW TO

REALLY GET COMMUNITY, I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THE CONSULTANT AND THE PEOPLE LEADING THE PROCESS FROM CITY COLLEGE TALK TO US. THANKS A LOT.

TRUSTEE RODIS: SCOTT FALCON.

MR. FALCON: GOOD EVENING. MY NAME IS SCOTT FALCON. I TOO WORK FOR MISSION ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION. I'M ALSO A RESIDENT OF THE MISSION.

I'M COMING AT THIS FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF MY JOB AT MEDA, WHICH IS COMMUNITY ORGANIZER. I MEET WITH OVER 15 DIFFERENT GROUPS PER MONTH, AND WHEN I TOLD PEOPLE AT THESE COMMUNITY GROUPS ABOUT THE PROPOSED CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS, THE INITIAL REACTION WAS TWOFOLD: ONE WAS EXCITEMENT THAT SOMETHING IS POSSIBLY POSITIVE AS THIS WILL HAPPEN THERE, AND THE OTHER ONE WAS SHOCK THAT THEY HADN'T HEARD ABOUT IT. 52

THESE COMMUNITY GROUPS WORK FOR POSITIVE CHANGE IN THE MISSION AND ARE VERY INVOLVED IN THEIR DIFFERENT BLOCKS, THEIR SPHERES OF INFLUENCE, AND ARE VERY TUNED INTO THINGS THAT MIGHT CHANGE THE MISSION EITHER POSITIVELY OR NEGATIVELY.

SO FOR THESE PEOPLE TO NOT HAVE HEARD

ABOUT EITHER THE PROPOSED CAMPUS OR THE EIR PROCESS NOR, OF COURSE, ABOUT THIS MEETING SAYS SOMETHING ABOUT THE WHOLE NOTIFICATION PROCESS AND THE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT PROCESS UP UNTIL THIS POINT. 52

I JUST WANT TO BRING TO THE BOARD'S ATTENTION A COUPLE OF COMMUNITY PROCESSES THAT HAVE HAPPENED: ONE IS ON 16TH STREET WITH THE BART PLAZA. BART ENLISTED MISSION HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION TO DO AN EXTENSIVE COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROCESS AND PLANNING PROCESS WHICH TOOK APPROXIMATELY THREE MONTHS AND WAS VERY GRASSROOTS COMMUNITY ORIENTED GETTING PEOPLE IN ON THE GROUND FLOOR AND COMING UP WITH THE PLANS FOR 16TH STREET. THAT IS, TO MY MIND, THE WAY THAT A VERY RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATION LIKE BART SHOULD PROCEED, AND THEY DID PROCEED.

I THINK THAT THE CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS ON MISSION BETWEEN 21ST AND 22ND WILL HAVE AS MUCH AN EFFECT AS THE CHANGE IN THE BART PLAZA ON 16TH STREET, AND I THINK THE SAME TYPE OF PROCESS SHOULD BE HAPPENING THERE. TO DATE, IT HAS NOT HAPPENED. 53

MY LAST POINT IS THAT THERE IS A

SMALL SCHOOL CALLED SYNERGY SCHOOL THAT'S A K THROUGH 8TH THAT'S GOING TO OPEN UP ON VALENCIA STREET BETWEEN 25TH AND 26TH STREET SOMETIME NEXT YEAR, AND THE PRINCIPAL OF THAT SCHOOL HAS ALREADY BEEN ATTENDING SEVERAL COMMUNITY MEETINGS IN THAT AREA AS A WAY TO OUTREACH TO THE COMMUNITY, LET THEM KNOW WHAT'S GOING ON, GIVE THEM INFORMATION, SOLICIT OPINIONS, AND BUILD BRIDGES WITH THE COMMUNITY.

AND CERTAINLY A SMALL SYNERGY SCHOOL WOULD NOT HAVE THE TYPE OF EFFECT THAT CITY COLLEGE CAMPUS WILL HAVE ON MISSION STREET BETWEEN 21ST AND 22ND, YET THE PEOPLE ASSOCIATED WITH THAT SCHOOL FOUND IT IN THEIR BEST INTEREST AND THE COMMUNITY INTEREST TO REACH OUT TO THE COMMUNITIES. 54

I WOULD JUST LIKE YOU TO CONSIDER THAT. THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.

TRUSTEE RODIS: RAQUEL MEDINA.

MS. MEDINA: THANK YOU FOR HAVING US HERE AND HAVING THIS HEARING ON THE NEW MISSION CAMPUS.

I JUST WANT TO TELL THAT YOU IT'S ABOUT TIME. I'VE BEEN A SAN FRANCISCO RESIDENT FOR ABOUT 30 YEARS. I WAS AN ATTENDANT OF THE 55

CITY COLLEGE SYSTEM. MY SONS WERE AND SO IS MY HUSBAND.

55 IT'S JUST ABOUT TIME. I'VE BEEN HEARING THAT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IS COMING TO THE MISSION, AND I HEARD THAT FROM CHUCK AYALA ABOUT 20 YEARS AGO. AND I WAS HEARING IT CONSTANTLY, CONSTANTLY, AND IT IS ABOUT TIME.

I AM SO EXCITED, BUT I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT IT HAPPENS. I WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT ALL OF US HERE, ALL OF US, WORK TOGETHER ON THIS. WE CAN'T LET IT NOT HAPPEN.

55 cont. THE NEW MISSION THEATER, WHICH HAS BEEN PRETTY DEAD AS FAR AS ATTRACTING PEOPLE TO THE MISSION, IS A VERY CRITICAL PIECE OF PROPERTY THAT HAS BEEN SITTING THERE, YOU KNOW, ATTRACTING A LOT OF LITTER AND HAS NOT GOTTEN ANY KIND OF ATTENTION. AND PEOPLE THAT WALK BY IT GET VERY NOSTALGIC BECAUSE THEY REMEMBER GOING THERE WHEN THEY WERE VERY YOUNG AND WHEN THEY WERE CHILDREN WITH THEIR PARENTS BEING ABLE TO DROP THEM OFF AND THEN PICK THEM UP, WHICH COULD NOT HAPPEN TODAY.

THERE IS NO THEATRE THERE. THERE IS REALLY A LOT OF DEAD SPACE, AND I'M JUST SO HAPPY THAT THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IS COMING

THERE. SO, PLEASE, MAKE IT HAPPEN. ↑55

I WILL DO WHATEVER IT TAKES TO HELP THAT PROCESS, YOU KNOW, GET DONE. WHATEVER IT TAKES. MY ORGANIZATION IS RIGHT ACROSS THE STREET. WE MEET WITH -- I DON'T KNOW HOW MANY -- PEOPLE EVERY DAY. I HAVE ABOUT FIVE OR SIX BUSINESS PLANS OF PEOPLE THAT WANT TO DEVELOP AROUND THE AREA ALREADY BECAUSE THEY'VE HEARD -- THEY'VE HEARD A LOT OF RUMORS.

SOME PEOPLE HAVE CALLED AND SAID "WE HEARD IT'S NOT HAPPENING. WHAT'S HAPPENING?" AND THEY GET VERY EXCITED AND VERY UPSET THAT THEY'VE HEARD THAT MAYBE IT'S GOING SOMEWHERE ELSE OR MAYBE THERE ISN'T ENOUGH MONEY.

I'VE BEEN VERY CAUTIOUS ABOUT INFORMING PEOPLE, BECAUSE I, YOU KNOW, JUST KNOW THAT THE EIR HAS JUST BEEN PREPARED. I'VE ATTENDED ONE MEETING MYSELF IN THE COMMUNITY THAT WAS HELD AT THE CAMPUS WHERE WE ALL THROUGH IN OUR VISIONS. AND, YOU KNOW, I DON'T KNOW HOW MUCH THAT WILL BE INCORPORATED, BUT WE JUST CANNOT LET IT NOT HAPPEN.

IT HAS TO -- IT HAS TO BRING IN, I THINK, AS MANY PEOPLE FROM THE COMMUNITY AS POSSIBLE. THEY ALL WANT TO HELP. THEY HAVE

CONCERNS ABOUT PARKING. THEY HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT TOO MANY PEOPLE. THEY HAVE CONCERNS ABOUT THE TYPES OF BUSINESSES THAT WILL BE AROUND THERE. BUT THEY DO WANT IT TO HAPPEN. THEY'RE ALL IN AGREEMENT.

SO WHAT WILL IT TAKE? I'M ASKING YOU HERE, AND I WANT A RESPONSE FROM YOU BECAUSE IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO ME. IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO THE COMMUNITY, AND IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO EVERYONE THAT COMES INTO THE MISSION.

THE CORRIDOR IS CRYING FOR IT, AND, YOU KNOW, I JUST WANT TO THANK YOU FOR MAKING THIS HAPPEN TO THIS POINT. BUT DON'T LET IT SLIP AWAY AND MAKE SURE IT'S THAT LOCATION. IF YOU'VE ALREADY GOT THE EIR, IT LOOKS GOOD. MAKE IT HAPPEN. OKAY. THANK YOU.

TRUSTEE RODIS: THANK YOU.

THAT CONCLUDES THE PUBLIC COMMENT ORTION OF THIS SESSION.

I JUST WANT TO ADD A PERSONAL OMMENT: I THINK IT WAS ABOUT SEVEN YEARS AGO HAT THERE WAS A PUBLIC -- THERE WAS A MEETING F THE BOARD RIGHT IN THIS ROOM WHERE THE ISSUE F THE TRANSFER OF THE 17TH AND FOLSOM STREET ROPERTY OWNED BY CITY COLLEGE WAS TRANSFERRED

TO THE CITY IN EXCHANGE FOR THE SOUTH BALBOA RESERVOIR.

I REMEMBER RIGHT IN THIS ROOM, THIS ROOM WAS FILLED WITH A LOT OF LEADERS OF THE MISSION COMMUNITY. JIM GONZALES, I REMEMBER, IN PARTICULAR, AND OTHERS WHO CAME FORTH AND SAID THEY WERE SUPPORTIVE OF IT IF WE WERE COMMITTED TO MAKING SURE THAT THE COLEGIO DE LA MISION WAS GOING TO BECOME A REALITY ONE DAY AND THAT WE WOULD COMMIT OURSELVES TO THAT.

THE BOARD PUBLICLY PLEDGE THAT WE WOULD NEVER FORGET THAT, AND THAT WE WOULD BE WORKING HARD TO MAKE SURE THAT THE MISSION CAMPUS WILL BE A REALITY. SO WE ARE VERY CLOSE TO THAT, AND WE'RE CERTAINLY GOING TO TAKE ALL THE COMMENTS THAT EVERYONE HAS BROUGHT IN TODAY.

THEY WILL BE PLACED -- WE HAVE TO GO THROUGH THIS PROCESS, AND WE WILL BE KEEPING IN TOUCH WITH THE PEOPLE WHO SPOKE AND THE OTHERS, AS WELL, WHO ARE NOT HERE. WE'LL BE KEEPING IN CONSTANT CONTACT WITH EVERYONE WHO WOULD WANT TO MAKE SURE THIS PROJECT GETS OFF THE GROUND AS SOON AS POSSIBLE WITH AS MUCH PUBLIC COMMUNITY SUPPORT.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR COMING. THIS MEETING IS ADJOURNED.

(MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:11 P.M.)

/////

/////

WE'RE NOW GOING TO GO INTO CLOSED SESSION.

UNDER THE TOPIC OF LEGAL COUNSEL, ANTICIPATED LITIGATION GOVERNMENT CODE 54956.9B, THERE IS SIGNIFICANT EXPOSURE TO LITIGATION AGAINST THE COLLEGE DISTRICT. THE DISTRICT HAS RECEIVED A LETTER FROM AN ATTORNEY FROM POTENTIAL PLAINTIFF THREATENING LITIGATION.

THE LETTER IS AVAILABLE FOR PUBLIC INSPECTION. THIS MEETING WILL NOW ADJOURN INTO CLOSED SESSION.

(MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:12 P.M.)

Public Hearing Transcript

The following responses are related to comments marked in the reporter's transcript of the public hearing on the Draft EIR held on May 27 by the San Francisco Community College District Board of Trustees. The name of each commenter is provided immediately before the responses for that person's comments.

Dr. Doris Ward

Response 38

The commenter's support of the Mission Campus project is noted. See Response 3, above.

Jose Mahar

Response 39

The Mission Merchants Association support of the Mission Campus project is noted. See Response 3, above.

Response 40

As noted in Response 9, it is possible that the additional student and faculty activity at the Mission Street site during evening classes could help to discourage street crime in the nearby area. Design issues related to night lighting and other crime-reducing measures should be considered during design development for the site and for individual buildings on the site, to occur later in project planning. See also Responses 14 and 51 for a discussion of public input into design of the Mission Campus facilities.

Response 41

The District has not finalized a process for obtaining community input into design decisions. See Responses 14 and 51 for a discussion of public input.

Response 42

See Response 3 regarding support for the project; see Responses 14 and 51 regarding public involvement in the design process.

Dr. Carlota del Portillo

Response 43

The Mission Campus Dean's discussion of the public information process to date is noted.

Response 44

As the comment notes, the District expects to provide notice to the Mission Economic Development Association of design review of Mission Campus facilities. See also Responses 14 and 51.

Jose Maestre

Response 45

As noted in the comment, the EIR is being prepared early in the project planning process. Building design has not yet begun.

David Valentine

Response 46

Support for the Mission Campus site is noted. See also Response 3.

Response 47

The comment notes that the project may bring more business to local merchants on Mission Street. As explained in Response 23, economic impacts are generally not required to be discussed in EIRs. It is possible that the additional nighttime activity that would occur at the site before, during and after evening classes would help to discourage street crime in the area, as stated by the commenter. See also Responses 9 and 40, above.

Response 48

Construction impacts and mitigation measures are discussed in the Initial Study, in Appendix A of the EIR; see also Responses 12 and 24, above.

Luis Granados

Response 49

The commenter's support of the Mission Campus project is noted. See Response 3, above.

Response 50

The California Environmental Quality Act requires that notice of the availability of a Draft EIR be provided by one of three listed means. Public notice was provided by two of the three: by publishing a legal notice announcing the availability of the Draft EIR and the date of the public hearing in *The Independent,* a newspaper of general circulation in San Francisco, on May 12, 1998; and by mailed notice to about 130 property owners and tenants adjacent to the proposed project site. In addition, going well beyond the public notice requirements of CEQA, the District mailed copies of the Draft EIR to interested persons and organizations, including to the speaker's organization, and over 60 notices of the availability of the Draft EIR and the date of the public hearing to public agencies and Mission District organizations and individuals, including a Capp Street neighborhood organization and a Dolores Park neighborhood organization. The notice of availability explained where copies

of the Draft EIR could be obtained or reviewed by any interested party. The distribution was compiled in part from a list of Mission District organizations maintained by the San Francisco Planning Department.

Response 51

The project analyzed in the EIR has been defined in sufficient detail to enable a determination of potential physical environmental impacts. Buildings for the site have not, however, been designed, nor is the building envelope finally established. As noted in Response 14, as well as in Responses 41 and 44, above, a process has not been finalized for obtaining public and agency input into the design of Mission Campus facilities, but the District intends to provide broad-based modification of the design process and ask for public input at a public hearing. Specific classes to be offered at the new site also have not been finally determined.

Scott Falcon

Response 52

Support for the project is noted. See Response 50, above.

Response 53

See Responses 14 and 51, above.

Response 54

See Responses 14 and 51, above.

Raquel Medina

Response 55

The commenter's support of the Mission Campus project is noted. See Response 3, above.

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES
C119703507